DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 938 EC 182 722

AUTHOR Holland, Richard P.; Noel, Margaret M.
TITLE A Review of Federal Legislation Concerning Special Education Personnel Preparation. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Inst. for the Study of Exceptional Children and Youth.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 72p.; For related document, see EC 182 723.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Compliance (Legal); *Disabilities; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Government Role; History; *Professional Education; Program Development; Public Policy; Special Education; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The report examines special education personnel preparation programs initiated under federal law. The evolution of the federal role in personnel preparation is reviewed beginning with the National Defense Education Act in 1958. Four federal initiatives are analyzed in detail: The Fellowship/Traineeship Program, the Program Assistance Grants, the Dean's Grants Projects, and the Regular Education Inservice Grants. Programs are addressed in terms of the stimuli for development, implementation data, and impact evaluations. Issues are raised, including the nature of reciprocal arrangements between institutions of higher education and the federal programs. It is concluded that the broad intent of the original legislation, establishment of a system to prepare personnel to educate the handicapped, has been met. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED269938

A REVIEW OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION CONCERNING SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL PREPARATION

Richard P. Holland
Margaret M. Noel

1985

TECHNICAL REPORT

Department of Special Education
College of Education
College Park, Maryland 20742

The Knowledge Base Project for
the Improvement of Personnel
Preparation in Special Education

Institute for the Study of Exceptional Children and Youth
University of Maryland

EC182742

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret M Noel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

This review of federal personnel preparation programs was developed as part of the Knowledge Base Project for the Improvement of Personnel Preparation in Special Education, a Special Project grant from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Special Education Programs. The purpose of the grant was to investigate major issues related to the training of special educators in the United States and has included several research studies as well as the preparation of technical papers addressing areas of personnel training.

This report, which is part of a larger effort examining the impact of the federal role in personnel development in special education, focuses on training programs initiated under Part D. Although the historical importance of the Part D federal initiatives, both in terms of their longevity and their impact on the profession of special education, is widely recognized, the programs are sparsely documented. Therefore, this review will attempt to construct a history of the programs, with several objectives in mind.

First, a comprehensive look at selected efforts will aid in understanding the impact of the federal role in personnel preparation. Second, a description of the evolution and implementation of the Part D projects will help to show how and why programmatic decisions were made. And finally, an historical review of the projects will present a context for field studies on personnel training.

Four federal initiatives have been selected for in-depth analysis: the Fellowship/Traineeship Program, the Program Assistance Grants (PAGs), the Dean's Grant Projects (DGPs), and the Regular Education Inservice Grants (REGIs). The first two programs represent the backbone of the Part D training effort; the second two represent major shifts in Part D program priorities.

The initial draft of this document was prepared following a thorough search of the literature. There are very few published facts and only slightly more published opinions or policy statements referring to the four training programs. The exception concerns the Dean's Grants Program, about which grant recipients have written an abundance of monographs, reports, books, and articles. When data about the programs were available from agency documents, Congressional testimony, or reports, they contained frequent discrepancies, particularly in the numbers of trainees and projects that were reported to have been funded. And finally, there was an almost total absence of evaluation or impact data.

To obtain additional information about factors that influenced the programs, forces that prompted changes in program priorities, and the impact the programs had, the authors of this paper interviewed a number of individuals who had been integrally involved with the personnel training program. Among the interviewees were Dr. Bruce Balow, Dr. Philip Burke, Dr. Edwin Martin, Dr. Herman Saettler, and Dr. Richard Shofer.

Both the archival data and interview information were incorporated into a draft document that was sent to all the interviewees and to several former or current chairs of departments of special education: Dr. Philip Cartwright, Dr. Melvyn Semmel, Dr. James Kauffman, and Dr. Edward Polloway. These individuals were asked to review the draft for accuracy and to provide additional information or perspectives on the federal training programs.

While the authors of this report attempted to incorporate, anonymously, the insights and suggestions they received from these individuals, it was considered imprudent to include some specific comments that reflected

individual perceptions of impact or interpretations of the internal politics surrounding programmatic shifts. However, when a concensus on such issues existed, the information was included. Although this conservative approach may, as one reviewer remarked, earn this report a "G" rating, such an approach is part of writing an "objective" history of the federal programs. Still, it is important to understand that behind every priority or program change under Part D there was controversy, resistance, and factional lobbying as well as strategy development and needs identification.

This paper has been divided into six major sections: an overview of the major special education legislation that has formed the basis for the federal training programs; reviews of the four major programs, including the stimuli for development, implementation data, and impact evaluations; and a final summary of the influences of the federal government in the area of personnel training. These sections provide a comprehensive look at one of the oldest and most important of the federal discretionary programs.

The Legislative Policy Base

Until the late 1950s, the general attitude toward any federal involvement in education could best be described as "negative to lukewarm" (La Vor, 1976). In 1958, this negative federal attitude toward aid to education was upset following the Russians 1957 launch of Sputnik, the first space satellite. In an effort to guarantee that the United States' educational system would not fall behind the Soviets', but would surpass it, the National Defense Education Act (P.L. 85-864) came into being. This act was designed primarily to stimulate programs for scientists and mathematicians whose work was deemed vital to national defense, but it also represented a major philosophical and policy shift for the federal government. It was the first major federal education program and initiated the federal government's incursion into public education in the United States.

In 1958 P.L. 85-926 was enacted, a law that opened the door for the eventual commitment of the federal government to the civil and constitutional rights of handicapped children. This act specifically authorized grants to institutions of higher education (IHEs) for training leadership personnel in mental retardation, and grants to state education agencies (SEAs) for training teachers of mentally retarded students.

The enactment of P.L. 85-926 stemmed from a realization in the 1950s that relatively few professionals were committed to training or research in the education of the mentally retarded. The law carried an authorization limit of $1 million annually. The graduate fellowship program authorized under P.L.85-926 was administered by the Section of Exceptional Children and Youth, U.S. Office of Education. At the time of passage, policy makers considered

training under the grants to be a short-term effort. It was considered that an initial cadre of highly trained professionals would eventually train the needed teachers, conduct research, and provide programming leadership in the field of mental retardation (Burke, 1976).

The trend toward categorical aid for handicapped persons was set in motion with the passage of P.L. 85-926, and legislative support quickened from that point. Amending P.L. 85-926, Congress passed P.L. 86-158 in 1959, which authorized $2,500 support grants to IHEs, for each graduate fellowship awarded. The 1961 amendments (P.L. 87-276) introduced Scholarships for the Deaf Program which provided $1.5 million annually for training classroom teachers of the deaf. This program signalled two important changes in the focus of federal support. First, the earlier mental retardation program supported training of leadership personnel, whereas the program for the deaf had its emphasis on classroom teachers. Second, the program opened the door for other categorical areas to seek federal support. The impact of these changes became apparent when in 1963, P.L. 88-164 (Section 301) added federal support for training teachers of the hard-of-hearing, speech impaired, visually impaired, emotionally disturbed, crippled, and other health-impaired students, and subsequently, in 1965, P.L. 89-105 authorized federal support for the training of research personnel.

P.L. 88-164 created a Division of Handicapped Children and Youth in the U.S. Office of Education. When President Kennedy signed the act, he officially established the division and appointed Dr. Samuel A. Kirk as its head. While the U.S. Office of Education had maintained an organizational unit of special education for many years, it was frequently a one-person operation used primarily for information gathering and dissemination (Riley,

Nash, & Hunt, 1978). Creation of the new division represented the first advance toward visibility and influence for the cause of special education within the federal bureaucracy.

The division had three branches, including a training branch. Even though the division received a Presidential citation, it was destined to be shortlived, and was abolished 18 months after its creation in a U.S. Office of Education reorganization effected by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10). In the reorganization all programs for the handicapped were dispersed, and the training branch was reduced to a Section and placed under the Division of Personnel Training in the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (Burke, 1976).

It was not until after the enactment of P.L. 88-164 in 1963 that the handicapped personnel preparation program began to receive substantial federal support. The funding level for personnel preparation increased from $2.5 million in 1963 to nearly $13 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 1964 and continued to increase steadily thereafter, reaching over $55 million in FY 1980.

In November, 1966, came the enactment of P.L. 89-570, which amended P.L.89-10 through the addition of a Title VI and created the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) to coordinate the handicapped program and provide leadership. The new Title VI established a program of grants to the states for the initiation, expansion, and improvement of programs for educating handicapped children in preschool, elementary, and secondary schools. Title VI created the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children for the Commissioner of Education. This law marked the creation of the Part D or personnel development program.

During the following year, the broadest program of benefits for the education of the handicapped was proposed by the Administration and passed by Congress. The 1967 amendments (P.L. 90-247) to P.L. 89-10 affected every program facet of BEH: manpower, research, media, and direct support for children in the schools. The amendments established regional resource centers to assist teachers and other school personnel by providing educational evaluation and assistance in developing specific educational programs and strategies. Further, grants or contracts could be awarded to develop programs for the recruitment of personnel into the special education field and related educational services. Awards could also be made for the development and distribution of information about these programs to parents, teachers, and others. In addition, the 1967 amendments expanded the media program to include all handicapped children; established centers and services for deaf-blind children; provided for program set-asides for the handicapped under Title III of P.L. 89-10; increased Title I funds for handicapped children in state schools; revised distribution formulas and increased funding of Title VI grants; and expanded the research and demonstration program (Martin, 1968).

During the early 1970s, Congress paid increased attention to the handicapped. Right-to-education lawsuits emerged. The BEH provided program visibility, and special interest groups such as the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) aroused national interest and Congressional concern.

Public Law 91-230 consolidated Title VI and created, as a separate act, the Education of the Handicapped Act. This act constituted a single statute authorizing programs in the U.S. Office of Education specifically designed to meet the special educational needs of the handicapped. The act broadened the authority and format of previously authorized programs including grants to

assist IHEs and other nonprofit institutions and agencies to assist them in training personnel for work with handicapped pupils. Also expanded were the research and demonstration programs and centers, and media services.

From January, 1970 to November, 1975, 61 bills were passed by Congress that directly pertained to the handicapped (Abeson, 1976). Two of the bills were of major importance. Congress approved a tremendous increase in authorization levels for P.L. 89-10 Title VI-B aid to states in the 1974 amendments (P.L. 93-380). These amendments enlarged the authorized funding level for education of the handicapped from $100 million to $600 million. The 1974 amendments also legislated the right to education for handicapped children, charged each state with establishing a goal of providing full educational opportunities for all handicapped children, and required states to develop comprehensive plans with objectives for carrying out the goal. Further, the amendments established provisions for statewide "child find" programs, due process safeguards, and assurance of confidentiality of records.

A year later, on November 29, 1975, President Ford, albeit somewhat reluctantly, signed into law the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 94-142, a measure that incorporated and expanded on the provisions of previous legislation. The intent of this act was to provide a free and appropriate public education for all handicapped children between the ages of 3 and 21 by 1980. P.L. 94-142 was an ambitious piece of federal legislation stating far-reaching goals. It was also permanent legislation with no expiration date, in stark contrast to normal Congressional procedure. The burden for assuring the provision of educational services to handicapped children, as mandated by the law, was placed on the states. That is, the states were required to develop plans, provide personnel, and procedures

for seeing that the goals of P.L. 94-142 were met. The P.L. 94-142 Amendments did not change Part D of P.L. 93-380, though they did affect the personnel preparation relationships among SEAs, local education agencies (LEAs), IHEs, and BEH through the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) provisions of the act (Burke, 1976). These provisions of P.L. 94-142 required that states provide needs-based training for both special and regular educators to ensure that teachers of handicapped children were appropriately and adequately prepared. This provision, as well as those intrinsic to providing a free and appropriate education to the handicapped, had major implications for the personnel development programs that had been established within BEH.

Finally, in 1983 Congress reauthorized the discretionary programs under P.L. 94-142 through the passage of P.L. 98-199. Included within these amendments was a refocused emphasis on personnel training resources for the preparation of special education personnel, and a requirement that the IHE grants meet recognized state and professional standards.

In amending Part D the House Committee on Education and Labor stated:

> The Committee recognizes that perhaps the most critical element in providing effective services to handicapped children is well prepared special education personnel. Without sufficient numbers of qualified personnel, the nation will always be a step away from the goal of Public Law 94-142, a free appropriate public education for all handicapped children. The Committee recognizes that personnel shortages continue to be a primary problem in many parts of the country.

> Programs under Part D have trained the majority of personnel in the field of special education, from classroom teachers to administrators, to university personnel. The value of Part D programs was particularly important after the passage of Public Law 94-142, when the need for significantly increased numbers of personnel was acute. (Weintraub and Ramirez, 1985, p.33)

Despite the strength of this reaffirmation of the importance of personnel training to the education of the handicapped, there have been challenges to the Part D program, including attempted budget cuts and threatened elimination of the program. Currently, the Part D program continues to support training of special education teachers, leadership persons, and related service providers as well as regular education personnel, parents, and volunteers. Such broad-based training is evidence of the strength of this program. While the early policy goal of a phase out of the personnel development program has not been realized, the program has continued to be influential.

The Fellowship/Traineeship Program

The Fellowship/Traineeship program, which grew out of the grants awarded under P.L. 88-164, was part of the federal government's effort to relieve the personnel shortage in special education. Under the program, there were six basic types of grants: undergraduate traineeships, graduate fellowships, summer session traineeships, special study institutes, program development grants, and special projects. An IHE could submit separate applications for different types of grants in one or more categorical areas of personnel preparation.

1. Undergraduate Traineeships. The purpose of these grants was to provide traineeships for full-time study at the junior or senior year levels. Traineeships were for one academic year, and an individual could be awarded one traineeship at each level.

Junior year trainees received a stipend of $300 to assist them in their full-time undergraduate study. IHEs were expected to utilize these traineeships to recruit outstanding students into the field of special education. The participating institution received no support grant with a junior year traineeship nor was there dependency support for trainees.

Senior year trainees received a stipend of $800 for full-time undergraduate study. For each senior year traineeship awarded, the participating IHE received a support grant of up to $2,000 to assist the program in which the student was enrolled. Trainees were not to be charged tuition or instructional fees. As with junior year traineeships, dependency support was not available for senior trainees, and in both cases an individual could not be awarded more than one traineeship.

2. Graduate Fellowships. The purpose of grants for graduate study was to assist IHEs in the preparation of personnel at the master's and post-master's

levels. Fellowships were awarded for full-time study for one academic year. An individual could be awarded up to five graduate fellowships: two at the master's level and three at the post-master's level. Graduate fellowships for the preparation of administrators were only available at the post-master's level.

Fellows enrolled for full-time graduate study at the master's level received a stipend of $2,200 and an allowance of $600 for each dependent. For each master's level fellowship, the institution received a support grant of up to $2,500 to assist the program in which the student was enrolled. Master's level fellowship recipients were not charged tuition or instructional fees and could be awarded up to two consecutive fellowships under this program.

Fellows enrolled for full-time graduate study at the post-master's level received a stipend of $3,200 and an allowance of $600 for each dependent. For each of these fellowships, the IHE received a support grant of up to $2,500 to assist the program in which the student was enrolled. Post-master's level fellowship recipients also were not charged tuition or instructional fees and could be awarded up to three 1-year fellowships.

3. Summer Session Traineeships. Federal assistance was provided for training programs for full-time summer study, as defined by the particular IHE. Pre-, post-, and intersessions were not interpreted as full-time summer sessions. A summer session trainee paid no tuition or fees and received a stipend of $75 per week. For each such traineeship awarded, the training institution received $75 per week to support the program. Dependency support was not available. When full summer sessions included part of a week (e.g., 7 weeks and 3 days), payments for less than a week were prorated on the basis of $15 per day for stipends and institutional support. Generally, summer session traineeships were for purposes of inservice education.

4. Special Study Institutes. These institutes were multi-purpose training vehicles that could serve various types of personnel, at various levels of preparation, for varying periods of time (but not for less than two consecutive days or less than one day per week for three consecutive weeks). An institute provided a period of intensive study and experiences for a specific group of participants. Institutes could be developed by IHEs or SEAs; however, it was assumed that the primary responsibility for the development of institutes rested with SEAs.

Institutes could be held for groups such as:

a. Personnel already trained in one or more areas of special education;

b. Other personnel (e.g., elementary supervisors, general school administrators, and recreation and physical education teachers who worked with handicapped students, although not full-time;

c. Experienced elementary and secondary teachers who were planning to enter the field of special education.

An institute participant paid no tuition or fees and received a stipend of $75 per week. No allowance was made for dependents, and payments were prorated at the rate of $15 per day for institutes of less than one week.

5. Program Development Grants. These grants were designed for two basic purposes:

a. To increase the number of quality preparation programs where no programs, or only rudimentary ones were available;

b. To expand existing quality programs to different levels of training (e.g., development of a doctoral program at an institution already having a strong master's program).

Funds were provided for new faculty positions, secretarial and consultant services, travel for staff and consultants, teaching supplies and materials, books, and communications costs for items such as telephones, stamps, and

brochures. These grants were for an award period, and generally did not exceed $20,000. An IHE could apply once for the renewal of a program development grant in an area in which a previous award had been made. The staff member identified as the program development coordinator had to be sufficiently free from teaching and other academic duties to devote the necessary time and effort to the development of the new or expanding program.

6. Special Projects Program Development Grants. The purposes of the special projects program development grants were to plan and implement new models of training, and to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of these new models in preparing personnel to work with handicapped children. Examples of some special projects that were funded include: a Special Education Microteaching Clinic, an Evaluation Consortium for Training Programs in BEH, and a Competency Based Teacher Education project. These were intended to provide the impetus to the field to develop, implement, and test new approaches in the preparation of special education personnel. Because the fellowship program otherwise offered no opportunity to explore new concepts or stimulate innovation, the special projects grants provided a means to give funds directly to programs (not students) and thus to increase both the flexibility and funding sources for IHEs.

In 1968, the special projects component of the program development grants was made a separate program component. The separation was aimed at drawing attention to the special projects concept since the goals of this program had not been adequately attained in the first 4 years under program development grants.

Over the years the special projects award program provided an opportunity for conceptualizing and implementing, on a trial basis, approaches which were

basically new or which were significant major modifications of existing programs.

Basically, there have been two types of grants within the special projects program component: planning and prototype (including evaluation) grants. Depending upon the complexity of the training problems and the readiness of the applicant to proceed, the grant could be of either type or a combination of both. The planning grants provided funds for the support of personnel, travel, and other costs necessary for developing a detailed plan for implementation of a prototype. In contrast, the prototype grants were used to implement and test new training approaches. While the fellowship/traineeship grants ended with the advent of the program assistance grants (PAGs) in the early 1970s, the special projects grants have continued to support innovative approaches to personnel preparation.

Program Funding

In its first year (FY 1960), the fellowship/traineeship program awarded $462,000 to IHEs and $523,000 to SEAs out of the $1 million appropriated by Congress under P.L. 85-926, as amended. These monies supported 84 IHE fellowships/traineeships and 92 SEA fellowships/traineeships plus the accompanying institutional support grants.[1] The IHE fellowships were awarded to 19 institutions that had the necessary staff and facilities to qualify for funding.

In FY 1962, Congress appropriated an additional $1.5 million for IHEs to encourage and facilitate the training of teachers of the deaf. Consequently, 446 additional fellowships/traineeships were awarded in the area of deaf education. In addition, this program awarded 38 development grants to IHEs to strengthen and improve deaf education programs.

---

[1] The specific IHEs and SEAs that received these initial awards were not identified.

When Congress expanded the provisions of P.L. 85-926 in 1963 to include the preparation of professional personnel in all areas of special education, it also significantly increased the fellowship/traineeship program authorization level from $2.5 million to $14.2 million.

From FY 1965 to FY 1966, Congress appropriated an additional $5 million to support personnel preparation under the fellowship/traineeship program. This increase in training grant support from $14.5 million to $19.5 million was aimed, in part, at expanding teacher training in the area of emotional disturbances. (As of 1965, only 15 IHEs in the United States had the staff and facilities to prepare teachers of the emotionally disturbed.) The FY 1966 appropriation was aimed at providing training for over 8,000 personnel.

Similarly, the FY 1968 appropriation reflected a $5 million increase in funding over the FY 1966 level, raising training grant support to $24.5 million. Of this $24.5 million appropriated for the fellowship/traineeship program, $19.4 million was utilized by IHEs to support approximately 2,239 fellowships, 1,433 senior year traineeships, 709 summer session traineeships, and 936 special study institute traineeships. In addition, 40 program development grants were supported. SEAs received $5.08 million for the support of approximately 343 fellowships, 132 senior year traineeships, 715 summer session traineeships, 3,258 special study institute traineeships, and administrative costs.

FY 1970 represented the last year of federal emphasis on fixed levels of support for individual students under the fellowship/traineeship program. The $29.7 million appropriated for training grants provided financial support to about 263 IHEs. That year these institutions produced approximately 4,210 leadership personnel and 6,942 teachers who entered the field of special education. Thus, by FY 1974, training grant support to IHEs and SEAs had risen to $12,992,000 supporting approximately 5,000 fellowships, trainee-

ships, and summer institute traineeships in all categorical areas. In addition, 42 program development grants were awarded to IHEs to initiate training programs in geographical areas of the country where there was a critical shortage of such programs.

Program Impact

The fellowship/traineeship program was the first large scale special education personnel development effort and, as such, had a major impact on the field. One of the major sources of data regarding program impacts was a study of personnel training programs conducted by Saettler (1969). According to this study, during the first 8 years following the establishment of this federal program, an additional 188 IHEs offered training programs in special education. In this same period, the number of undergraduate training programs rose from 418 to 774, while the graduate level training programs increased from 381 to 794 in the field.

From 1961 to 1969 one of the greatest increases in the number of training programs occurred in the area of mental retardation: a 278% increase in undergraduate programs and a 200% increase at the graduate level. At the same time, undergraduate programs in the visually handicapped area increased 35%, and the graduate programs increased 21%. Preparation programs for teachers of physically handicapped showed a gain of 147% in undergraduate programs and 117% in graduate programs. The IHEs preparing speech and hearing personnel showed an increase of 85% at the undergraduate level and 108% at the graduate level. The most dramatic increases, however, took place in the number of programs preparing teachers of the emotionally disturbed, with a 530% increase at the undergraduate level and a 700% increase at the graduate level of training.

The greater increases in graduate training can be attributed in part (Johnson, 1968) to the federal emphasis on funding both fellowships/ traineeships and program development grants at the graduate level as opposed to the undergraduate level. While it is extremely difficult to measure the effect that federal funding at one level at a university had on the general development of the special education program or department, the support grant that came with a federal award at the graduate level could be used to pay part of a faculty member's salary. This faculty member could teach both undergraduate and graduate level courses, and in some cases, could teach across disability areas (Saettler, 1969).

According to the Saettler data, from 1961 to 1969, there was a total increase of 370% in students enrolled in IHE special education training programs. The student enrollment figures for this same period show an increase of 66,651 students receiving professional training at IHEs in the field of special education. The area of mental retardation showed the greatest absolute gain in student enrollment: 33,309 students at all levels of training. In contrast, the area which showed the smallest numerical increase was the visually handicapped area, with 1,445 students. In short, in terms of impact, there was a five-fold increase in student enrollment across categorical areas of training subsequent to passage of the P.L. 85-926 amendments (Saettler, 1969).

Between the years 1960 and 1967, 232 grant awards were made for the development of training programs (Lucito, 1968). During this same period, the number of participating IHEs under the fellowship/traineeship program rose from 16 to 243. Prior to the late 1960s, only 21 states had programs preparing special education personnel (Saettler, 1969). Similarly, the number of SEAs (including trust territories) participating in this federal program rose

from 23 to 54 (Heller, 1968). While no studies have directly linked the growth of programs to the federal program, it is generally acknowledged that the federal funds stimulated the start of new programs across a wide geographical area. The funds also enhanced the strength of existing programs through increases in enrollments and faculty, particularly at the graduate level.

Both the interviewees and reviewers for this paper strongly pointed to the significant impact that the fellowship/traineeship program (and later Program Assistance Grants) had on the field of special education. One reviewer cited the accepted if not established "fact" that virtually every leader in the profession who received a doctorate over the past 20 years was a recipient of federal training stipends or grants. The result, according to the reviewer, has been the development of a cadre of highly trained researchers, teachers, and program administrators "who have become the backbone of the profession." Other interviewees, in noting the growth of programs as well as leadership personnel, cited the multiplier effects of more Ph.D.s: more programs = greater numbers of teachers trained = better public school programs for handicapped children. Furthermore, the impact of these same individuals on subsequent research and innovative program development is assumed to be great. In short, the original federal program virtually spawned an entire profession or at least dramatically enhanced the growth of a fledgling one. While the improvement of program quality is in the realm of professional judgement, the sheer increase in the number of professional special educators - leadership persons and teachers - resulting from the federal funds is testimony to the significant impact of the fellowship-trainee programs.

The impact of the federal program on IHEs in terms of improving the quality of special education training programs is difficult to assess.

Quality, however, according to Heller (1968) became a major issue under the fellowship/traineeship program. Advisory review panels of experts in special education were appointed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to assist IHEs in developing and evaluating their training programs in special education. These reviewers evaluated all areas of the IHE training programs and subsequently made recommendations to the Division of Training Programs pertaining to their quality. The criteria upon which such program evaluations focused included: (a) appropriateness of training program goals and objectives; (b) qualifications of IHE staff; (c) adequacy of practicum experiences and practicum site selection; (d) comprehensiveness of course content; (e) breadth and depth of course sequence; (f) adequacy of library and supporting facilities (e.g., diagnostic centers and clinical facilities); (g) strength of institutional commitment (e.g., the authority, responsibility, and administrative and fiscal support given to the director of special education training for program implementation); and (h) effectiveness of student selection procedures.

To initiate this peer review process, staff from The Division of Training Programs apprised IHEs of the specific elements of quality required to secure federal support. Regional conferences were held to discuss with participating IHEs the evaluation criteria to be used for professional preparation programs. Further, reports reviewing the qualitative elements of training programs were distributed to IHEs which submitted applications for federal support (Heller, 1968). IHEs desiring continued federal support were required to address the federal evaluation criteria in their proposals.

The emphasis on program evaluation and peer review was indeed unique. The implementation of both of these concepts was seen by several interviewees as a major administrative accomplishment. However, like many good ideas, this one became diluted during implementation. As one reviewer said:

The evaluation component of the training grants was often interesting reading. In many cases, the proposal writers went to great lengths to evaluate all aspects of the project except impact on teachers or children. Granted, such evaluations are expensive, but nevertheless they should have been encouraged. The Bureau, on the other hand, routinely excised large portions of grant requests which dealt with evaluation on the grounds that such activities should be carried out by the institution anyway. Thus, a Catch-22 situation existed. Furthermore, the fadism encouraged by the Bureau was fascinating, if not detrimental to the field. The major fad which comes to mind was the DEM-Discrepancy Evaluation Model.

The desire to improve the quality of special education training programs led the Training Division to evaluate the fellowship/traineeship program in the late 1960s. At issue was tying the funding level to student stipends in an effort to get "more for the money" and provide greater flexibility to programs by allowing them to adjust individual components (i.e., fellowship/traineeship stipends and institutional support grants) to the individual needs of the IHE (Lucito, 1968).

The issue of cost efficiency was an important factor in the Bureau's efforts to secure additional funds for the training programs. In addition, a federal task force had cited the clerical inefficiency - specifically redundancy in the grant review award process - of the fellowship program. However, there were also other issues of concern to the BEH administration. The organization of the fellowship/traineeship program had resulted in establishing disability "fiefdoms." An individual BEH project officer administered all grants for a specific disability area such as mental retardation, visually

impaired, etc., with relative autonomy. The need to weaken the divisions between the disability areas was necessary to ensure greater uniformity in program standards as well as to allow for expanding funding priorities to include cross-disability training such as in the early childhood area.

These issues as well as federal concerns about increasing manpower production, improving manpower planning, and stimulating greater experimentation in training programs led to the advent of the program assistance grants (PAGs).

Program Assistance Grants

By 1971 the Division of Training Programs was receiving over 1,000 proposals annually seeking regular training program support (as opposed to special projects support). Each year a full and detailed proposal had been required of each categorical unit requesting funds within an IHE. This procedure required a substantial clerical workload and tended to preclude long-range planning efforts on the part of the IHE. Without a comprehensive planning effort with clearly stated objectives, it was difficult for the IHE and the Division to systematically evaluate program accomplishments. Input rather than output measures had sufficed as the evaluation criteria (Balow, 1971).

Further, the yearly requirement for separate categorical applications funded in fixed amounts for student fellowships and traineeships, with a set figure of IHE support, caused several significant problems. First, there was a fixed linear cost that the Division had to pay for each student trained. Thus, the per unit cost of training personnel did not decrease with increased investment. Secondly, though the Division had an "interrelated" (non-categorical) unit, and the IHEs had been encouraged to try non-categorical training models through the special projects program, the regular funding program

had not encouraged experimentation and flexibility in training patterns. Finally, there was little IHE/SEA coordination concerning state and regional manpower needs and training programs. Some (Balow, 1971) felt that this coordination could be facilitated by comprehensive, multi-year grants.

Major Features

The objectives of the PAG program were to establish: (a) a three-year cycle of support decisions;[2] (b) an evaluation requirement for all supported programs; (c) one comprehensive proposal per institution for regular award program funds (as opposed to special projects); (d) maximum levels of basic program support for IHEs (based on levels, quantity, and complexity of training programs); and (e) field reader evaluations plus site visits as the basis for decision-making (Balow, 1971). In FY 1971, approximately 15 IHEs were asked to submit, on a trial basis, a comprehensive proposal which consolidated all separate categorical fellowship/traineeship program proposals. The following year (FY 1972), all applicants for federal training grants in special education were required to submit one comprehensive proposal covering all categorical areas of training.

The basic support period for a PAG was 3 years, with interim modifications possible. One comprehensive application was submitted by an IHE every 3 years, including an evaluation plan and updated budget. A report of activities was submitted annually. Institutions could apply for categorical support,

- - - - - - - -

[2] Initially (FY 1972), approximately one-third of the IHEs were placed on 3-year support, one-third on 2-year support, and one-third on 1-year support. This implementation strategy allowed the Division of Training Programs to receive comprehensive proposals from approximately one-third of its applicants each year once the multi-year funding system was in operation.

block funds, or other patterns of support as approved by federal project officers. Ceilings were established for maximum levels of basic program support based on levels, quantity, and complexity of the individual training programs.

As part of the program monitoring and evaluation, program officers conducted site visits to review programs and to provide technical assistance to those IHEs most in need of advice and guidance. The site visits have, however, always been constrained due both to lack of travel money as well as program staff. Thus, evaluation activities have always been less extensive than originally conceived and have focused more on review of proposals and less on on-site review or information. Nonetheless, the program required an evaluation plan for each project, and consultants were occasionally used for on-site technical assistance to IHEs having professional/technical problems. Further, consultants/experts were used as field readers for IHE proposal funding decisions, replacing the panel process utilized under the former fellowship/traineeship program.

The switch to the comprehensive PAG was not uniformly popular. According to several former agency administrators, some staff within the Training Division resisted the loss of power and authority that accompanied management of all the grants for a specific disability area. Further, there was opposition in the area of mental retardation which had the potential of losing the most training support. There was a surplus of mental retardation training programs, but there was neither incentive nor movement to establish new training programs in shortage areas because faculty wanted to maintain the "old order."

Program Funding

The FY 1972 federal budget of $33.9 million for the handicapped personnel preparation program placed emphasis on improved production of teachers in special education. To accomplish this objective, special emphasis was put on the development of new training programs and new ways of utilizing federal training funds to stimulate output. The FY 1972 training funds supported 120 program development and special project grants (compared to 63 funded in FY 1970 and 105 in FY 1971). Of these 120 grants, 80 were special projects to develop new training models. Further, experimentation with institutional support grants, variable fellowships and traineeship awards (geared to student financial and institutional needs), and institutional incentive plans was encouraged.

This experimentation reflected the gradual changes in personnel production and support patterns which were implemented by federal program staff over the 3-year period from 1970 to 1972. From an emphasis on fixed levels of support for individual students, 1971 and 1972 showed a definite movement toward support of programs, or PAGs, with variable levels of student support based on local plans. Although IHEs were given increased flexibility and autonomy under PAGs to determine the best use of their federal training funds, federal guidelines similar to those under the fellowship/traineeship program were retained, setting maximum levels for student support and dependency allowances.

With the funding shift toward support of programs, not individual students, the Division was able to target funds on priority manpower areas. For example, in FY 1972, a total of 30 new programs were funded in rural areas, predominantly Black colleges, early childhood education, and career education (all designated as FY 1972 priorities for federal support under the

handicapped personnel preparation program). A focus for special projects in FY 1972 (20 projects) was the preparation of "surplus" teachers for work with handicapped students and of specialists in vocational-technical education of handicapped pupils.

According to data presented to Congress, the FY 1972 federal training funds directly supported 6,325 students in undergraduate and graduate training programs in special education. More dramatic however, was the total personnel output from federally supported IHE training projects: an estimated 22,700 program graduates. Thus, approximately three additional teachers were produced for every trainee receiving federal financial assistance in FY 1972.

In FY 1974 (covering Academic Year 1974-1975), federal training funds in the amount of $39,615,000 provided program support for 565 projects and direct financial support to 21,000 students. Table 1 presents the distribution of funds.

Table 1.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR FY 1974

Educational Level	No. of Projects	Funds	Percent	Number of Students
Academic year training	410	$24,416,000	61.6	4,830
Instructional models	54	5,823,000	14.7	966
Regular education	27	1,459,000	3.7	2,499
Continuing education	56	6,084,000	15.4	12,516
Paraprofessional	12	641,000	1.6	189
Special projects	6	1,192,000	3.0	N.A.
TOTAL	565	$39,615,000	100%	21,000

While the FY 1974 funding allocations continued to emphasize the development of new training models, there was a slight shift away from academic year training of special educators toward training regular educators and paraprofessionals to work with handicapped students, as well as a 15.4% reallocation of federal training funds for the support of inservice training for special educators. These funding shifts from FY 1972 to FY 1974 reflect, in part, awareness of the personnel preparation demands placed upon LEAs as a result of the mainstreaming movement precipitated by the least restrictive environment (LRE) provisions.

These manpower demands dramatically intensified with the passage of P.L. 94-142, and a number of SEAs were predicting that the lack of trained personnel (both regular and special educators) would be a major barrier to full implementation of the law by 1978, as required by Congress. Specific concern centered around the P.L. 94-142 priorities for serving those handicapped students who had been previously unserved or underserved by LEAs, (e.g., severely handicapped students and preschool handicapped children). Thus, the FY 1976 distribution of federal training funds reflected these legislative priorities. In addition to the preparation of personnel in the two priority areas, federal training funds were targeted at special education training for regular classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, physical education and recreation personnel, and vocational and career education teachers. As Table 2 shows, the federal support available for inservice training doubled from FY 1974 to FY 1976 in an attempt to meet the personnel preparation demands of implementing P.L. 94-142 in school systems across the country. Further, Table 2 reflects a decrease in federal funds for the development and implementation of new training models as compared to the FY 1974 distribution of training funds.

Table 2.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR FY 1976 (School Year 1976-1977)

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Preservice[a]		Inservice[a]		All[a]	
Preparation of Special Educators	Amount	Trained	Amount	Trained	Amount	Trained
Early childhood	$ 4,500	1,400	$ 1,720	2,860	$ 6,220	4,260
Severely handicapped	7,500	2,220	1,940	3,230	9,440	5,450
Paraprofessional	1,000	660	345	575	1,345	1,235
Physical education	780	250	215	360	995	610
Recreation	700	225	200	335	900	560
Interdisciplinary	500	235	180	300	680	535
General special education	8,925	2,705	3,060	5,100	11,985	7,805
Vocational/career education	1,140	335	570	950	1,710	1,285
Subtotal	$25,045	8,030	$ 8,230	13,710	$33,275	21,740
Special Education Training for Regular Classroom Teachers	$3,550	---	$ 4,098	11,543	$ 7,648	11,543
Instructional Models						
Developmental assistance	NA	NA	$ 500	835	$ 500	835
Model implementation	$ 3,000	810	$ 500	835	$ 3,500	1,645
Subtotal	$ 3,000	810	$ 1,000	1,670	$ 4,000	2,480
TOTAL	$31,595	8,840	$13,328	26,923	$44,923	35,763

[a] Estimated to receive financial assistance from this source. (There are approximately four students enrolled in a given institution or program for every preservice student receiving such assistance.) [b] Direct financial assistance related to the preservice training of regular classroom teachers is not provided. Regular classroom teachers receiving inservice training are allowed up to $15 per diem when training is held at a site away from the school.

The FY 1976 federal monies available for personnel preparation support totalled $44,923,000. This budget figure reflects an increase of over $5 million from that of FY 1974. The FY 1976 training funds provided program support for 723 projects (an increase of over 150 projects from those funded in FY 1974) and direct training to 35,763 students (an increase of more than 14,000 students from those supported in FY 1974). The significant increases in projects funded and students trained over this 2-year period reflect the increased federal attention to inservice training of regular and special educators.

This emphasis on inservice training was clearly reflected in the FY 1978 distribution of federal training funds. From FY 1976 to FY 1978 there was a funding shift from preservice to inservice activities in each of the 11 categories targeted for federal assistance. Table 3 presents the FY 1978 training funds distribution. In addition, a new federal funding priority emerged in FY 1978: the training of volunteers to work with handicapped students. This new funding priority as well as the continued shift in funding from preservice to inservice clearly represented federal attempts to assist SEAs and LEAs in fully implementing the service mandate of P.L. 94-142.

The FY 1978 training funds in the amount of $45,375,000 provided program support for 715 projects at 415 IHEs and agencies and direct training to 45,285 students. While the number of projects supported remained relatively constant from FY 1976 to FY 1978, the reported number of students trained increased by 10,000 over this two-year period.

The FY 1980 Congressional appropriation for special education personnel development was $55,375,000, a dramatic $10 million increase over the FY 1978 budget for federal training support. The $55,375,000 budget was broken down into preservice training at $28,517,000 (51.49%) and inservice training at

Table 3.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR FY 1978 (School Year 1977-1978)
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Preservice[a]		Inservice[a]		All	
Preparation of Special Educators	Amount	Trained	Amount	Trained	Amount	Trained
Early childhood	$ 3,732	1,166	$ 2,488	3,828	$ 6,220	4,994
Severely handicapped	5,664	1,770	3,776	6,743	9,440	8,513
Paraprofessional	814	543	1,221	1,878	2,035	2,421
Physical education	678	212	452	695	1,130	907
Recreation	618	193	412	634	1,030	827
Interdisciplinary	522	249	348	535	870	784
General special education	5,082	1,588	3,388	6,050	8,470	7,638
Vocational/career education	1,467	458	978	1,505	2,445	1,963
Subtotal	$18,577	6,179	$13,063	21,868	$31,640	28,047
Special Education Training for Regular Education Teachers[b]	$ 3,420	---	$ 5,130	12,825	$ 8,550	12,825
Instructional Models						
Developmental assistance	NA	NA	$ 970	589	$ 970	589
Model implementation	$ 2,130	666	$ 1,420	2,367	$ 3,550	3,033
Volunteer program	266	177	399	614	665	791
Subtotal	$ 2,396	843	$ 2,789	3,570	$ 5,185	4,413
TOTAL	$24,393	7,022	$20,982	38,263	$45,375	45,285

[a] Estimated to receive financial assistance from this source. (There are approximately four students enrolled in a given institution or program for every preservice student receiving such assistance.) [b] Direct financial assistance related to the preservice training of regular classroom teachers is not provided. Regular classroom teachers receiving inservice training are allowed up to $15 per diem when training is held at a site away from the school.

$26,858,000 (48.51%). This 48.51% of federal funds allocated for inservice training underscored the gradual increase in the percentage of program funds that were used to support such training over the previous 6 years; only 3.8% of the federal training monies were allocated for inservice activities in the FY 1974 personnel preparation budget. In addition, the LRE provision required more training for regular education teachers, which was reflected in the increase of support for this funding category from 20% of the federal program funds in FY 1978 to 34% in FY 1980. Table 4 presents the distribution of FY 1980 federal training funds.

The FY 1980 personnel preparation monies provided training for approximately 91,989 persons; 7,174 received preservice training and 84,815 received inservice training. A total of $19,125,000 was allocated for special education training for 47,000 regular education teachers, while $13,218,000 were earmarked to train 4,089 new special education teachers. In addition, $9,062,000 supported training for 10,533 support personnel, including paraprofessionals, and persons in the fields of physical education, recreation, and vocational and career education. Finally, $5,800,00 were used to fund approximately 50 grants which developed innovative models of instruction for personnel training.

Program Impact

The impact of the move to PAGs was considerable at several levels. From a purely bureaucratic standpoint, PAGs resulted in increased efficiency and cost effectiveness.

From its advent, the PAGs program substantially reduced the number of proposals to be processed during any given year, since it eliminated the need for proposal submission in each categorical area, and reduced the frequency of

Table 4.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR FY 1980 (SCHOOL YEAR 1980-81)

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Preservice		Inservice		Total	
	Amount	Trained	Amount	Trained	Amount	Trained
Preparation of Special Educators						
Early childhood	$ 3,698	1,155	$2,465	6,117	$ 6,163	7,272
Severely handicapped	5,024	1,571	2,951	7,787	7,975	9,358
General special education	4,496	1,363	2,754	7,227	7,250	8,590
TOTAL	$13,218	4,089	$8,170	21,131	$21,388	25,220
Preparation of Support Personnel						
Paraprofessionals	$ 1,051	744	$ 762	1,799	$ 1,813	2,543
Physical education	957	299	493	1,109	1,450	1,408
Recreation	728	227	359	886	1,087	1,113
Interdisciplinary	971	303	479	1,076	1,450	1,379
Vocational/career	1,523	475	652	1,662	2,175	2,137
Volunteer program	434	292	653	1,661	1,087	1,953
TOTAL	$5,664	2,340	$3,398	8,193	$9,062	10,533
Special Education Training for Regular Education Teachers						
Regular education Teachers	$ 7,250	not estimated	$11,875	46,929	$19,125	46,929
Instructional Models						
Developmental assistance	---	---	$ 725	1,782	$ 725	1,782
Model implementation	$ 2,385	745	2,690	6,780	5,075	7,525
TOTAL	$2,385	745	$3,415	8,562	$5,800	9,307
Comparison of Preservice and Inservice Training Programs for:						
Special education	$13,218	4,089	$ 8,170	21,131	$21,388	25,220
Support personnel	5,664	2,340	3,398	8,193	9,062	10,533
Regular educators	7,250	---	11,875	46,929	19,125	46,929
Instructional models	2,385	745	3,415	8,562	5,800	9,307
TOTAL	$28,517	7,174	$26,858	84,815	$55,375	91,989

submission of comprehensive proposals. It was intended that this improved clerical efficiency would allow federal program specialists to concentrate more of their time on providing technical assistance to projects and other professional activities and less on management and clerical activities. The extent to which this occurred varied across program officers; nonetheless, management of the grant award process was significantly streamlined.

A second impact was the decreased per unit cost of training personnel to work with handicapped students. In FY 1970 (the last year of federal emphasis on fixed levels of support for individual students under the fellowship/traineeship program), the $29.7 million appropriated for federal training grants provided financial support to about 263 IHEs. These institutions produced that year approximately 4,210 leadership personnel and 6,942 teachers who entered the field of special education. In FY 1972 (the first year of federal support for programs under PAGs) a federal budget for personnel preparation of $33.9 million directly supported 6,325 students in undergraduate and graduate training programs in special education. However, the total personnel output from federally supported IHE training projects was estimated at 22,700 program graduates -- over twice as many as were produced in FY 1970. Thus, approximately three additional teachers were produced for every teacher trainee receiving direct federal financial assistance in FY 1972. The accelerated growth and efficiency in manpower production was directly attributed to the PAGs which supported faculty members, in addition to providing direct financial support to individual students. These faculty trained non-funded as well as funded students.

Beyond a purely administrative level, the comprehensive PAG provided an opportunity for increased federal direction and shaping of training programs. The criteria established for the evaluation of applications for federal training funds provided the basis for federal program staff efforts to influ--

ence the design, content, and quality of special education training programs ofred by IHEs. These criteria were added in response to a need to improve cooperative manpower planning among states, LEAs, and the training programs as well as to provide at least some documentation of program effects.

For example, to improve manpower planning, applicants were required to provide evidence that program graduates were meeting the educational needs of handicapped children at the local, regional, and/or state level. Further, applicants were required to provide (a) the number of personnel prepared and placed in positions relevant to the education of handicapped students; (b) the type and location of positions accepted by program graduates; (c) the number of handicapped children served by program graduates; (d) the length of time that program graduates served handicapped students; (e) the employers' evaluation of program graduates' proficiency; and (f) an assessment of the effectiveness of program graduates "in facilitating the educational progress of handicapped children." Finally, applicants were required to delineate the competencies that each PAG program graduate would acquire as well as the evaluation procedures used in measuring the attainment of those competencies. This emphasis on accountability increased somewhat gradually over the years of the PAG program with criteria added as certain data or reporting needs were identified or as a call arose for more stringent program accountability. The effectiveness of these funding criteria, however, have always been tied to the effectiveness of the peer review process.

More important than pushing grantees toward accountability was the fact that PAGs provided federal program staff a means by which federal support for personnel preparation could be focused on particular manpower needs or priority areas. As noted earlier, one major impetus for creation of the PAG program was to increase the responsiveness of training programs to Bureau-wide

priorities such as education for the severely handicapped, early childhood education, rural education, etc.

Further, the PAG program design encouraged innovation and experimentation among grantees. PAGs supported non-categorical resource room teacher training programs; teacher-consultant training programs; generic teacher training programs in the mildly, moderately, and severely handicapped areas; and diagnostic-prescriptive teacher training programs. Thus, the PAG program has been responsive to a broad range of program emphases and philosophical positions both federally and locally.

The PAGs also provided special education programs with more stable federal support than the fellowship/traineeship program did, and the multi-year grants allowed program faculty great latitude in using their grant monies. There was no requirement that students be paid a stipend, or that tuition be waived, and IHEs could hire additional staff, develop curricula, purchase resource materials, or expend their federal support in ways that best met their individual needs and improved the quality of their training programs.

There is general consensus that PAGs dramatically strengthened special education training programs and in many cases resulted in creation of actual departments or autonomous program areas. A number of professional leaders have informally expressed the belief that PAGs, as an extension of the fellowship program, are responsible for creation of a bona fide field called special education.

Yet, there was a byproduct to this federal support that some see as dependency and over-reactivity to federal priorities. The federal government has long used its discretionary monies to promote current agendas, and in the process has established an interesting symbiosis with higher education. While BEH actively sought or was open to input from the field when establishing new

priorities, the input was not necessarily representative of all factions or segments of special education. Yet, BEH used IHEs as conduits for effecting change in educational programs. As a new need emerged, a priority might be added to shift training programs into developing new training sequences (Balow, 1984). Special education departments learned to depend on federal training monies which in turn inhibited proactive or independent decision-making by the faculty. Thus, ironically, the federal assistance which established the field of special education as a profession may have become an obstacle to the field's continued professional growth.

This issue of reactivity was challenged by some of this paper's reviewers. One former program head and long-time recipient of PAG and other federal grants agreed with Balow that:

> Increasing dependence of special education departments on Federal monies has occurred, but innovative and creative projects and ideas have <u>not</u> diminished because of federal impact. Rather, the <u>recognition</u> of those ideas has been diminished by the use of an egalitarian but ineffective peer review process. Many innovative programs and projects have not been funded because peer reviewers in some cases (certainly not all and this is not intended to indict all reviewers) are simply not up to speed with respect to contemporary research, methodology, and field direction. Given the selection process for obtaining panel reviewers and field readers, it is not surprising that many of them are not adequately prepared for such an important job. Over the years the peer review process has been increasingly diluted by an increasing dependence upon representatives rather than expertness in the review panel.

Another reviewer felt that over-reactivity occurs in federal programs to the extent that federal objectives governing financial assistance are narrow and are not established through broad consultation from the field. However, with respect to PAGs, this reviewer stated:

> On balance, PAGs worked strongly in the direction of allowing maximum local autonomy consonant with the BEH need to ensure that the tax dollars expended were used responsibly and efficiently. The PAG emphasis on output as the primary criterion, together with an insistence on evaluation of the program and its products, allowed IHEs wide latitude in which to make their own decisions, yet federally established priorities clearly shaped the direction of emphasis from year to year. Early childhood education, rural, vocational education and transition from secondary to adult did not simply arise out of a myriad of individual decisions in IHEs or SEAs across the country that suddenly synchronized into a shared objective. They became priorities because federal officers decided they should be, and the IHEs and SEAs responded. That circumstance is, of itself, neither necessarily bad nor necessarily good. But it has the potential for both, depending upon how democratically the federal officers obtain their information and how rigorously the IHE and SEA personnel insist upon participation in the policy decisions that, in fact, dictate major directions in the preparation of personnel to educate handicapped children.

Finally, in addressing the impact of these large program grants, one reviewer was strongly supportive of the notion that these programs stimulated

innovation and enhanced the profession. While acknowledging that one could only make inferences not supported by empirical data, he stated:

> Prior to federal funding there were very few comprehensive training programs at IHEs... they grew as a function of federal stimulation ...which was the intent of Congress. As growth in numbers increased, there was a corresponding growth in the number of special education service personnel produced; there was an increase in the number and quality of innovative programs; there was a quantum increase in methodologically sound research findings emanating from IHEs, etc.

Despite an absence of empirical data, it seems safe to say that the PAGs have had a substantial influence on the development of personnel in special education and on the founding and development of the special education profession.

Regular Education Inservice Grants

REGI was the first major program aimed at training regular educators to work with handicapped students. The grants began in response to the increasing concern about the training needs of practicing regular educators responsible for providing handicapped children with an "appropriate education in the least restrictive environment."

Prior to the 1975 passage of P.L. 94-142, considerable political and judicial activity relative to the right to education had already occurred at the state and federal levels. Several states had passed their own version of P.L. 94-142 and various pieces of federal legislation included provisions for educating handicapped children. These actions held important implications for

regular educators, for they would be expected to become increasingly involved in the process of educating the handicapped. Considering few regular class teachers, administrators, or specialists had the knowledge and skills necessary to assume the new roles demanded of them, massive preservice and inservice programs were essential.

Historically, the Division of Training Programs within the Office of Education referred all program requests for the training of general educators and related professionals to the larger Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (BEPD) within the Office of Education. The BEPD had a series of authorities and programs designed to train general educators. Fifteen percent of the money in each program was to be used to increase general educators' awareness of and sensitivity to the needs of handicapped children. With the demise, in the early 1970s, of BEPD and the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, its short-lived heir, requests for training were left in the hands of the Division of Training Programs. The provision for funding inservice training of regular educators was part of the original regulations for Part D of Title VI of ESEA (P.L. 91-230). As evidenced by data presented in the preceding section, increased amounts were allocated in the early 1970s for inservice training projects for regular educators. Funds were being increasingly diverted to regular education as a result of internal decision-making within the division as well as strong recommendations on the part of national teachers' associations, school administrators' organizations, as well as state and local education agencies.

In 1976, a pivotal Government Accounting Office (GAO) Report to Congress was released that provided for major funding shifts in the personnel preparation budget. According to the data submitted by GAO, the capacity of colleges to prepare specialists in the education of the handicapped had increased to the point that the anticipated demand for these specialists had been

fulfilled. On the other hand, the need for special skills training for regular class teachers was great considering the increasing numbers of handicapped students being educated in the regular classroom. GAO recommended that greater efforts on the part of the Office of Education were required to ensure that regular educators received the training required to effectively educate the handicapped as mandated by the LRE provision of P.L. 94-142.

The Office of Education, in response to the report, contended that the data were collected several years prior and that BEH funding for the previous 3 years reflected a recognition of the training needs of regular educators. From FY 1974 to the proposed budget for FY 1976, funds targeting regular educators rose from 0 to 8% for preservice training and from 3.8 to 9.3% of the total training budget for inservice training. However, according to GAO these fiscal efforts had only limited impact.

In response to the report, as well as strong internal support from the program administration, Congress appropriated additional federal monies to support preservice and inservice training for regular educators. Subsequently, the two training programs, REGIs and the Deans' Grant Projects were developed.

The REGI projects represented a special federal funding category under the Division of Personnel Preparation (DPP). As such, these projects were administered by federal program staff in much the same way as the PAGs. That is, REGI projects were funded on a 3-year support cycle; applicants submitted one comprehensive proposal for federal support every 3 years, with an evaluation, updated budget, and report of REGI activities submitted annually.

Priorities for Inservice Training

During the 1977 funding period, DPP staff began to solicit criteria for best practices in inservice training. To better understand the emerging directions and priorities for inservice training across the country, DPP awarded the CEC a grant for the 1977-78 school year. The purpose of this grant was to analyze training needs identified by SEAs in their Annual Program Plans submitted to BEH, a required submission under P.L. 94-142's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development. Further, CEC was to produce a prototype resource directory, a format for cataloging existing inservice training materials keyed to the training needs identified in the annual plans, and to produce a set of training materials targeted on these needs.

According to the CEC Survey, the two areas of highest need were the instructional and behavioral management of handicapped students; and the skills related to the development, implementation, and review of the individualized education program (IEP) requirements of P.L. 94-142. These areas of need were further supported by state-level CSPD needs assessments. Closely related to the IEP priority were the training areas of child evaluation procedures, instructional procedures, and classroom management needed to carry out the objectives of the IEP. Other priority areas included personnel training related to least restrictive environment, protection in evaluation, procedural safeguards, and the role of the surrogate parent.

Essentially the CEC project verified what informal sources of information had reported to DPP:

1. There was a great need for special education training among regular educators;

2. There was a shortage of successful inservice models and materials for training these personnel;

3. The quality of inservice training provided was uneven;

4. The needs assessment procedures used by the states varied in terms of sophistication.

Responding to these needs, DPP established the training of regular educators as one of 12 priorities for funding under Part D discretionary monies.

Nature of the Program

REGIs were awarded in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Territories of Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa. In most cases, the projects were funded as 3-year grants to SEAs, LEAs, IHEs, intermediate education agencies, or nonprofit organizations.

The major goals of the REGI program were to:

1. Create an awareness among regular educators of the special needs of handicapped students;

2. Improve general educators' attitudes toward handicapped pupils and increase their knowledge of the characteristics of handicapping conditions;

3. Increase their competency and skills in working with handicapped students;

4. Improve local mainstreaming efforts;

5. Increase regular educators' understanding of the P.L. 94-142 provisions.

A major portion of REGI training was provided in very "general" areas and intended to cover a broad spectrum of knowledge and skills related to the education of handicapped pupils. Thus, a good deal of this inservice was global in nature and provided the trainees with a generalist's view of the field of special education.

Program Funding

The initial federal investment in the REGI program was $6,235,000. During FY 1977 (Academic Year 1977-78), these funds supported 90 projects which trained 15,588 regular educators. Table 5 shows that from 1977 to 1980, federal support for special education training of regular educators at the inservice level nearly doubled.

Table 5.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR REGI PROJECTS

Fiscal Year	Total Level of Funding	Projects Supported	Trainees
1977	$ 6,235,000	90	15,588
1978	6,500,000	126	26,472
1979	11,875,000	207	138,800
1980	11,875,000	196	138,000
1981	8,800,000	132	101,000

REGI projects ranged in funding support from $1,000 to $345,000, with an average annual funding of $50,000. Despite the strong inservice emphasis, IHEs were the most frequent grant recipients.

The REGI program targets were regular education teachers. However, DPP flexibility in REGI projects' use of funds encouraged the training of school administrators, supervisors, psychologists, therapists, counselors, physical education teachers, paraprofessionals, volunteers, and parents. By 1982, which was the last year of federal support for new REGI projects, nearly 475,000 educational personnel had received training under the REGI program at a total federal cost of $38,000,000.

National Inservice Network

To support the REGI projects, DPP awarded a grant in 1978 to Indiana University to develop a National Inservice Network, which was designed to facilitate the successful implementation of funded REGI projects and link interested inservice providers including SEAs to projects which met their states' needs. The project, which continued until 1982, was under the direction of Dr. Leonard C. Burrello.

The National Inservice Network was a temporary organization designed to exchange information about inservice projects for regular educators among the directors of those projects as well as among state and local school personnel, professional organizations, the federal government, and other interested parties.

Program Impact

In 1979, the BEH contracted with Applied Management Sciences (AMS) to conduct a national assessment of the status of inservice training including evaluating the impact of the REGI grants. From 1977 to 1982, nearly 475,000 educational personnel received inservice training under the REGI program. According to the AMS (1982) evaluation, the projects' training successes were generally broad; however REGI inservice training was rated by teachers and administrators as significantly more useful than other inservice training. The training was also considered to be more comprehensive and better focused than in other inservice efforts. Further, REGIs were regarded as useful to LEAs in helping them organize their own staff development efforts. According to AMS, many REGI projects were described as a "trainer of trainers" model to produce a multiplier effect. The extent to which this approach was successful

was not determined or documented, however. The AMS report also noted that the most commonly used training site for REGI activities was the public school building, which they considered strong evidence of an effort on the part of IHE projects to place REGI training where it was most appreciated and useful. Similarly, AMS considered it noteworthy that most REGI project trainers were educational practitioners in local school districts, a finding they felt further reflected the effort by the REGI program to "localize" the inservice process. A final impact cited by AMS was an improvement in "some" LEAs' policies and services related to mainstreaming handicapped students. However, fewer than 3% of the REGI projects reported attempts to evaluate change in student performance as a result of inservice, and only two projects made attempts to measure costs of inservice and apply cost effectiveness measures to inservice models and outcomes (Burrello, Byers, & Cline, 1981).

While on the face of it, REGIs appeared relatively successful, the effects were generally short-lived as projects frequently lacked major LEA support or commitment for continuation. More significant was the fact that even at peak funding, the REGI grants were touching only a small percentage of regular educators. Thus, in FY 1983, DPP funding priorities shifted once again to support preservice training of personnel to work with handicapped students. Consequently, the REGI program, as it had operated from 1977 to 1982, was terminated. Contributing to the decision to terminate the REGI program was the growing consensus among federal policymakers that given funding limitations, the federal government could not possibly have a significant impact on the inservice education needs of regular educators across approximately 14,000 LEAs in the United States.

Dean's Grants Projects

The Dean's Grants Program, which actually preceded the REGI initiative, was also begun in part as a response to the overwhelming numbers of regular educators needing training in special education. Even as BEH began funding regular education inservice projects, program administrators were aware that the scope of the training needs far outdistanced the available resources. So, as one former program administrator said, "We decided to go to the 'head of the stream' and attempt to impact on the training that regular education teachers received." Thus, DGPs were designed to be awarded to colleges of education for the purposes of (a) increasing regular teacher educators' awareness of P.L. 94-142 and the related changes that were taking place in public schools, and (b) facilitating curricular changes in regular teacher-preparation programs.

There were other motivations for establishing these programs. In 1975, the organization of schools and colleges of education still followed the traditional separation of regular and special education, conceptually, physically, and psychologically. Many faculty members in regular education programs considered themselves to be academic scholars, and thus minimized any ties to public school education. In some IHEs, the windfall of federal funds to develop special education training programs further separated the two faculties. Thus, DGPs were seen as a means of opening the communication between the two faculties, nurturing their cooperation and facilitating the programmatic reorganization of regular education preservice training.

Nature of the Program

Dean's Grant Projects were initiated in 1975 under the leadership of Dr. Edwin W. Martin, then head of BEH. They were designed to support faculty development and curricular change in regular teacher education programs at the preservice level. Through this support, BEH hoped to encourage regular teacher education programs to prepare their graduates to work with handicapped students in regular education settings as mandated by Public Law 94-142.

The DGPs were linked through a National Support Systems Project, which was directed by Dr. Maynard C. Reynolds at the University of Minnesota. That project conducted regional and state meetings, provided technical assistance to individual projects, linked DGP work to other national activities, and published materials to assist DGPs in carrying out their work and disseminating their project products. Eight regions, each headed by a dean (or former dean) of education, composed the National Support Systems Project structure.

The concept of DGPs was to place deans of education in the critical role of advocate of curricular reform. Dr. Martin's original program announcement was direct in requesting the dean's assistance "as a change agent." In an attempt to achieve lasting curricular reform, the DGPs were awarded to deans in the belief that they held key positions for planning, persuading, and negotiating across schools or colleges of education. In addition, deans were considered to be in a position to link DGPs activities to larger goals of the colleges as well as to statewide activities in teacher education, certification, and accreditation (Sivage, Reinhard, & Arends, 1980).

The DGPs, like the REGIs, represented a special federal funding category under program assistance grants. As such, these projects were administered by federal program staff in much the same way as the PAGs; that is, DGP recipients enjoyed considerable flexibility in deciding how best to use their

federal funds. Similarly, DGPs were funded on a 3-year support cycle. Institutions of higher education submitted one comprehensive application for federal support every 3 years, with an evaluation, updated budget, and report of DGP activities submitted annually.

Program Funding

Early DGPs were supported at levels of approximately $35,000 per year. Throughout the 7 years (1975-1982) that the DGP program was in operation, the federal grants to IHEs remained relatively small, with the average project support just above $40,000 annually. Funds were primarily employed for the release time of a senior faculty coordinator, secretarial support, consultants, and travel to promote interproject dissemination and network activities.

The initial federal investment in the Dean's Grant program was $1,400,000. During FY 1975 (Academic Year 1975-76), these funds supported 39 charter projects. Table 6 shows that from 1975 through 1980, federal support for special education training of regular education faculty at the preservice

Table 6.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR DEAN'S GRANT PROJECTS

Fiscal Year	No. of Projects Supported	Total Level of Funding
1975	39	$1,400,000
1976	60	3,230,000
1977	75	3,230,000
1978	92	3,420,000
1979	117	6,486,000
1980	141	7,250,000
1981	132	6,187,000

level increased dramatically. In FY 1980, the height of federal funding for the DGPs, 141 DGPs were in operation in 45 states, the District of Columbia, and two territories. These recipient IHEs were responsible for preparing over 38% of the new teachers in the United States.

By 1982, which was the last year of federal support for DGPs, approximately 260 colleges and universities had been DGP recipients for time periods ranging from 1 to 7 years. This number does not include the additional 56 institutions of higher education that received indirect technical assistance or materials provided by several national and regional DGP networks, notably the National Support Systems Project and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

The DGPs were intended to be short-term catalytic agents for curricular reform that would reflect increased IHE faculty understanding of P.L. 94-142 and specifically the LRE provision. Long-term federal support for DGPs was never planned. Because of this and because of questions and concerns regarding the effectiveness of the initiative, competing DPP funding priorities, such as training teachers to work with severely handicapped students, supplanted funding for the DGPs in 1983. However, limited funding continued to be available to IHEs under the DPP funding category of Specialized Training of Regular Educators.

Program Impact

The DGP was certainly one of the more controversial of the federal personnel training programs. Interviewees and reviewers for this paper expressed strong comments regarding the program. One individual described the grants as one of BEH's "biggest boondoggles," stating that the grants sup-

ported the deans' own agendas, "bought political support," and "had absolutely no measurable effects on the special education training of regular educators." Another individual stated:

> As a reviewer of Dean's Grants proposals, a follower of the program, a visitor to programs, and a faculty member in an institution which received those Dean's Grants, I am personally convinced that the Dean's Grants program was the greatest waste of money in the history of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. I challenge you now to locate more than a dozen of the 260-300 Dean's Grants which are still in existence or which can show tangible continuing effects of the Dean's Grants programs. The evaluation component was generally extremely poor, follow-up was negligible, and for the most part the money was used to bolster sagging or decaying elementary education programs. I assert that the major impact of those programs was not to help regular educators work more closely with special educators and handicapped youngsters but rather to curry favor of deans and regular education departments and thus broaden the political base of the Bureau.

The vast majority of information including evaluation data available on the DGPs has come from the grant recipients, published by the National Support Systems Project, which published prolifically. According to several of these documents (Reynolds, 1980; Sivage, et al., 1980; Whitmore, 1980), the DGPs accelerated several facets of change in teacher education in response to P.L. 94-142. Grants were reported to have facilitated stronger IHE faculty cooperation and more systematic planning and curricular reform. In addition,

recipients felt that most institutions with mature DGPs achieved significant positive changes in general education faculty attitudes.

In addition, DGP representatives reported that there was "probably" improvement in the ability of faculty members to work directly with handicapped college students in their own programs. Other results attributed to DGPs by recipients were improved faculty attitudes toward the handicapped, development of varied instructional products, enhanced cooperation with local schools, and enhanced leadership on the part of the deans.

For almost all DGPs, an outcome was the enhancement of activities with professional organizations, especially the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, the National Alliance of Black School Educators, and various state-level task forces and commissions on professional standards and guidelines for teachers.

While most of these effects are unsupported by data, Reynolds (1980) did report results of a survey of DGP recipients that indicated that of those IHEs that completed at least the third year of funding, 72% reported completion of curricular revision; 87% reported increased faculty knowledge/skills; 88% reported significant increases in student knowledge acquisition; and 69% reported completion of comprehensive program changes. However, these reported results or impacts of the DGPs have not been entirely supported by impartial evaluation.

Both an evaluation of the DGPs conducted by Teaching Research (1982) and an internal agency review of DGPs (Hagerty, Behrens, & Abramson, 1982) raised substantial questions about the success of the projects. Specifically, the DGPs were found most lacking in the areas of practical student teaching revisions and program evaluation. For example, only a few of the former DGPs reported the use of practicum and student teaching with handicapped students to complement revised coursework offerings, and less than 30% of the final

reports submitted to the Division of Training by DGP recipients indicated revisions in practicum experiences. Further, a substantial number of projects (even those supported for 4-6 years) did not address the issue of success of graduates. This failure was particularly problematic because the ultimate objective of the major DGP components (faculty development and curriculum refinement) was to positively impact the knowledge and skills of graduates in the area of special education.

In short, the DGPs produced controversy and mixed results. The direct and indirect effects of these projects will likely be debated for some time to come, with a consensus unlikely. Nonetheless, the program represented one of the more visible initiatives in the history of the personnel development programs.

Summary and Conclusions

This report has reviewed four of the federal personnel development initiatives supported under the Part D program. Throughout the years that the program has been providing funds, a number of training priorities have emerged, such as in the areas of related service providers, and parents and volunteers. Across these programs, with the partial exception of the Special Projects Program that has supported innovative "models" and other creative projects, the major goal has been to provide support for training personnel to work for the handicapped. And together, these federal initiatives have had major impacts on the quality and quantity of special education personnel across the nation.

In summarizing this review of the programs and offering conclusions, it is clear first that the establishment of the Part D program, as articulated through the fellowships and PAGs, had an overwhelming influence on the establishment and solidification of the field of special education as a separate profession. As one example, during the first 8 years under the fellowship/traineeship program established by P.L. 82-926, 188 additional IHEs offered training programs in special education, and from 1961 to 1969, there was a 250% increase in the number of students enrolled in the IHE training programs in the area of special education.

As noted under this paper's impact sections for fellowship/traineeships and PAGs, there is strong agreement that these programs have influenced the development and likely the direction of the entire field. The issue of reactivity that may have been fostered as a result of the influx of federal funds into programs can only be conjectured, and nothing in the program literature suggests that federal funds have had anything but positive effects and

that instructional commitments to the training programs reduced reliance on federal money. No national data have been collected to establish this impact. However, a separate study involving 25 departments of special education in a sample of 5 states conducted by Noel, Valdivieso, and Fuller (1985) addressed the issue of impact of these federal "development" funds. Among the 25 programs, slightly over half had either begun with federal Part D funds or had such stimulant funds in the early years of program growth. Further, faculty in those programs that had received such federal funds spoke of the positive effects of federal dollars, including graduate student stipends and professional development monies.

The degree to which the programs have experienced declines in size or quality as a result of loss of funds is, of course, another issue. Information derived from the Noel, Valdivieso and Fuller (1985) study suggests that while funds do not affect faculty size, lack of student stipends, supply money, and professional development (e.g., consultant, travel, etc.) monies have curtailed innovation and enhancement of programs.

On the issue of reactivity, there does appear to be a reciprocal arrangement between higher education and the federal programs: training, research, and program development. For a variety of reasons, most of which are obvious, IHEs frequently are the major grant recipients in a discretionary program. Thus, as the federal government initiates a priority change in an attempt to influence policy or practice in special education, the IHEs become the conduit for the federal message. Yet, faculty from the IHEs, albeit selectively, have significant input into the federal priorities. This reciprocity is neither reactive nor proactive and most likely represents some sort of balance of "power" between the federal government and the profession it helped create and nurture.

On another issue, it is not surprising that the data and information used in preparation of this document were both scant and contradictory. For a given project year, data on projects funded or allocation of funds could differ markedly across sources. Further, as would be expected, individuals' perceptions of how or why certain programmatic decisions were made differed. What is left is the sense that shifts in priorities or new program initiatives were not based on sound data but were often political and based on personal beliefs or "testimonials." This appeared to be less the case with the early program than with the move into regular education and inservice training. Nonetheless, throughout the entire process of collecting information, the caution was to "look at what (the program people) did, not what they said they would do."

However, since this is a descriptive document, the above issues may be little more than stretched inference and are highly debatable. At the very least, though, the evidence should be sufficient to demonstrate that the broad intent of the original legislation, the establishment of a system for the preparation of personnel to educate the handicapped, has been met, to the benefit of handicapped children and youth in the United States.

References

Abeson, A. (1976). Section I: The educational rights of exceptional children - overview. In F. Weintraub, A. Abeson, J. Ballard and M. LaVor (Eds.), Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Applied Management Sciences. (1982). The status of inservice training to prepare educators to work with handicapped students (Final Report). Silver Spring, MD: Applied Management Sciences.

Balow, B. (1971). Proposal for multi-year funding. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Balow, B. Personal interview. March 13, 1984.

Burke, P. (1976). Personnel preparation: Historical perspective. Exceptional Children, 43, 144-147.

Burrello, L.C., Byers, K., & Cline, D. (1981). Reaching for quality practices through personnel development: A future plan. Submitted to U.S. Department of Special Education, Office of Special Education, Division of Personnel Preparation.

Geiger, W.L. (1983). 1983 national directory of special education teacher preparation. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Hagerty, G., Behrens, T., & Abramson, M. (1982). The dean's grant initiative: Fostering an agenda of shared responsibility in teacher education. In B. Sharp (Ed.), Dean's grant projects: Challenge and change in teacher education. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota.

Heller, H. (1968). Training of professional personnel. Exceptional Children, 34, 539-543.

Johnson, J. (1968). Teacher preparation for educating the disturbed: Graduate, undergraduate, or functional? Exceptional Children, 34, 345-351.

LaVor, M. (1976). Section II: State and federal policy for exceptional children. In F. Weintraub, A. Abeson, J. Ballard and M. LaVor (Eds.), Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Lucito, L. (1968). Division of training programs - its mission. Exceptional Children, 34, 531-536.

Martin, E. (1968). Breakthrough for the handicapped: Legislative history. Exceptional Children, 34, 493-503.

Noel, M.M., Valdivieso, C.H., & Fuller, B.C. (1985). Determinants of teacher Preparation: A study of departments of special education. College Park, MD: Institute for the Study of Exceptional Children and Youth, University of Maryland.

Reynolds, M. (1980). The dean's grant projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota.

Riley, D., Nash, H., & Hunt, J. (1978). National incentives in special education. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Saettler, H. Students in training programs in the education of the handicapped. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1969). (University Microfilms No. 70-13, 468).

Sivage, C., Reinhard, D., & Arends, R. (1980). Operationalizing advocacy: An analysis of deans' roles as project directors of deans' grants. Portland, OR: University of Portland.

Teaching Research (Baldwin, V. et al.). Executive summary of a national survey of regular education pre-service projects. Monmouth, OR: Author, 1982.

Weintraub, F.J., & Ramirez, B. (1985). Progress in the education of the handicapped: An analysis of P.L.-98-199, the Education of the Handicapped Amendments of 1983. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

The dean's grant projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. (1980). Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota.

Whitmore, J. (1980). What have we learned from the dean's grant projects? In The dean's grant projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota.

APPENDIX A

Federal Programs that Support Personnel Preparation

FEDERAL PROGRAMS WITH PERSONNEL TRAINING FOR THE HANDICAPPED

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Special Education Branch

Contact: Diane Goltz, Director 703-325-7810
703-325-0660

This office oversees inservice training at primary and secondary schools within the Department of Defense. This inservice training is carried out at the Federal, State, and local levels. The Office of Dependent Schools sometimes pays Special Education departments at universities to carry out this training. The amount of money spent on inservice training is not known by Diane Goltz.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Division of Assistance to States
Handicapped Preschool and School Programs
Part B, Education of the Handicapped Act

Contact: Kathy West 732-1044

This entitlement program provides funds for states to educate their handicapped children. In order to receive the funds, personnel training is required by the state recipient as part of the state program for meeting the educational needs of handicapped children. The budget for the program in Fiscal Year 1984 was $1,068,875,000.*

Division of Innovation and Development
Handicapped Children's Early Education Program

Contact: Caroline Smith 732-1159
Becky Calkins, Director 732-1156

This program supports experimental demonstration, outreach and State implementation of preschool, and early childhood projects for handicapped children. According to Caroline Smith, one small component is an extension project called "Outreach." Outreach offers training for personnel to work with the handicapped. The 1984 fiscal budget for all parts of this program was approximately $21,000,000.

* Even though more current budget figures are available, the FY '84 figures provide an indication of the relative levels of support for these programs.

Division of Innovation and Development
Handicapped Innovative Program-Deaf-Blind Centers

Contact: 732-1154
Paul Ackerman 732-1155

This program supports sixteen regional deaf-blind centers. They provide direct services to deaf and blind children through subcontracting. This includes diagnostic and evaluative services, a program to help each client adapt to his handicap, and consultive services for parents, teachers, and others concerned with the welfare of the program's clients. They also sponsor demonstration projects concerned with innovation in the education of the blind and deaf. Funds are provided for inservice training at these centers (Feistritzer, 1981). The budget for Fiscal Year 1984 was approximately $15,000,000.

Division of Innovation and Development
Programs for Severely Handicapped Children and Youth

Contact: Paul Ackerman 732-1155

These programs provide educational and training services for severely handicapped youth. This does not include teacher preparation except when it is necessary for a program to function. By way of grants and contracts, it does include inservice training for parents of the severely handicapped (Office of the Handicapped, 1980). According to Paul Ackerman, the budget for Fiscal Year 1984 was approximately $4,000,000.

Postsecondary Education Programs for Handicapped Persons

Contacts: Betty C. Baker 732-1264
Joe Rosenstein 732-1176

This program supports the development, adaptation, operation and dissemination of specially designed model programs of post secondary, vocational, technical, continuing or adult education for handicapped individuals. The applicants include State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, junior and community colleges, vocational and technical institutions and other appropriate non-profit agencies. Priorities are for the four regional centers for the deaf and its model programs for individuals with handicapping conditions other than deafness. These programs should facilitate the handicapped individuals's education with their non-handicapped peers. The budget for Fiscal Year 1984 is $2,200,000. Limited inservice training is permitted for participants who work directly with the handicapped post-secondary students.

Division of Personnel Preparation
Special Education Personnel Development

Contact: Max Mueller 732-1070

This program trains personnel to work with the handicapped. The recipients include non-profit agencies, institutions of higher education, state education agencies and local education agencies. Areas of emphasis include preservice special education training, limited inservice training, training of support personnel, and the development of model training programs. The budget for Fiscal Year 1984 was $55,540,000.

National Institute of Handicapped Research (NIHR)
Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers

Contact: Mr. Leclair 732-1134

The NIHR sponsors 31 Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers in collaboration with institutions of higher education. The main emphasis is on research, but they do provide training for graduate students. In addition, they disseminate the results of their research into preservice programs. They also sponsor inservice and continuing education programs to inform and improve the skills of professionals, paraprofessionals, consumers, parents, and others involved in rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation Services Administration
Paraprofessional Interpreter Program for the Deaf

Contact: Wallace Babbington 732-1322

This program has provided $990,000 in funds for the last five years to train interpreters for the deaf at 10 universities and community colleges.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Service

Rehabilitation Services Administration
Division of Resource Development
Rehabilitation Services: Training

Contact: Dr. Martin Spickler, Director 732-1282
Gloria White, Budget Office 732-1358
Harold Shey 732-1350

This program trains personnel to provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals. Recipients of grants include public and private non-profit organizations as well as institutions of higher education (Feistritzer, 1981). The 1984 fiscal budget for this program was $22,000,000.

Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Division of Adult Education
Adult Education

Contact: William Langner 245-0636

Adult education programs in 50 states help adults obtain their General Equivalency Diploma. They provide inservice training for teachers to work with the handicapped. This includes inservice training for the learning disabled. The states carry out the programs with the help of an estimated $100 million from the Federal government for Fiscal Year 1984.

Vocational Education

Contact: Chet Bunyan 472-3440
Charlotte Conoway 245-9608

Funds from the Fiscal Year 1984 budget of $716,205,758 were used to train personnel to work with the handicapped. Most of the funds earmarked for training are for inservice training. The states appropriate Federal funds according to their needs.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of Developmental Disabilities

University Affiliated Facilities (UAFs)

Contact: Roland Queen
Madeline Schultz 245-1961

The office gives administrative and core support to 36 established centers and 5 satellite centers affiliated with universities. These centers provide services to the developmentally disabled and mentally retarded. Virtually all of them include a training component. Looking through a sample of these programs, one can find training programs for paraprofessionals, physicians, medical students, special education students, special educators, babysitters, parents, nurses, and social workers. Organizations and universities wishing to become one of the University Affiliated Facilities serve first as satellite centers. The program's budget for Fiscal Year 1984 was $7,143,000.

Developmental Disabilities
Administration for Children, Youth, and Families
Project Headstart

Contact: 755-7782

Headstart provides education activities for pre-school children from low income families. In any one of these 15 regional programs, at least 10 percent of the children must be handicapped. In 1981, there were 45,430 handicapped children in 1741 Head Start programs. They made up 12.3 percent of the total enrollment. At least some of the programs provide for the training of personnel to work with handicapped. The program's budget for Fiscal Year 1984 is estimated at $995,750,000.

Public Health Service

Maternal and Child Health Training

Contacts: Mr. Pompei 443-2340
Mrs. Cook 443-2350

This program provides grant money for the training of medical personnel to work with mothers and infants, especially those at high risk. Mrs. Cook estimates that in 1984 $22,000,000 went towards the training of pediatricians, physicians, occupational therapists, and other medical personnel.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Contacts: Charles Cordova 343-6675
Goodwin Cobb

In 23 states the Bureau of Indian Affairs sponsors a Comprehensive System for Personnel Development. This includes both inservice and preservice training for those working in the school system with the Indian handicapped. For preservice training alone, the Federal budget for this program was an estimated $2,000,000.

Action

Older American Program
806 Connecticut Avenue
Room 10006
Washington, DC 20525

Contact: Delpha Arnold 634-9349

The Older American Program consists of the three programs listed below. Each of these programs could conceivably provide grant money for personnel training.

Foster Grandparent Program: The Foster Grandparent Program provides funds for low-income volunteers age 60 and over to work with the mentally retarded in community projects. Grants awarded totalled $34,900,000 in Fiscal Year 1979 and $48,400,000 in Fiscal Year 1984.

Retired Senior Volunteer Program: This program provides funds for senior citizens to work with other senior citizens. Many of these volunteers are professionals. The budget for this program in Fiscal Year 1984 was $27,445,000.

Senior Companion Program: The Senior Companion Program provides funds for low-income volunteers age 60 and over to care primarily for the elderly with emotional and physical impairments. Grants awarded included $7,000,000 in Fiscal Year 1979 and $12,045,000 in Fiscal Year 1984.

Office of Voluntary Liaison
Mini-Grant Program

Contact: 634-9772

This program sponsors small community projects to directly benefit the community. Some of the small grants of $5,000 or less could conceivably go toward the training of personnel to work with the handicapped. Grants are based on a formula of $5,000 for 5,000 volunteer work hours.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Cooperative Extension Service
Science and Education Administration-Extension
Department of Agriculture
Washington, DC 20250

Contact: 344-2713
Mr. Marvin Konhya 447-2602

Programs are not specifically targeted for the handicapped, but they may place some emphasis on servicing the handicapped. In particular, the 4-H clubs actively encourage the participation of handicapped youth. The Cooperative Extension Service may train paraprofessionals, home economists, and volunteers to work with the handicapped. The budget for Fiscal Year 1977 was $198,946,175; for Fiscal Year 1984 it was $334,340,000. States match 40 percent and counties 20 percent of the Federal funds given to the States for distribution.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Educational and Research Improvement

Library Services and Construction Act (LSDA-Title 1)

Contact: Ms. Bell 245-5680

A construction act for libraries requires the construction of facilities at libraries for the handicapped and possibly the training of personnel to work with the handicapped in libraries. Followship programs involved minorities, bring in new technology, and service special populations. During the 1984 fiscal year the budget for the program was 65 million dollars. Approximately 50 million dollars of this sum go toward the construction libraries.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Title I Grants for the Disadvantaged

Contact: Bend Rice 245-9846

Federal grants to States service to raise the educational attainment of disadvantaged children in elementary and secondary schools. The LEAs in each state receive a percentage of the state Title I allocation based on how many disadvantaged children they have. Although it is fairly unlikely, an LEA may require funds for personnel training for the handicapped children in its district who are economically disadvantaged. The program's budget for fiscal year 1984 was approximately 3 billion dollars.

Office of the Secretary

Discretionary Grant Program

Contact: Dr. Enderlein 474-1762

This program provides ten grants of $100,000 each for innovation educational projects. Within a grant proposal, a personnel training component can be included if it fits within the sphere of elementary and secondary education.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Division of Assistance to States
Handicapped Regional Resource Centers

Contact: 732-1052

This program funds regional resource centers for the purpose of both giving out information and providing technical services for the education of the handicapped. Unless a state with a regional resource

center specifically requests funds for personnel training, no funds for personnel training are provided. The program's budget for fiscal year 1984 was $4,500,000.

Division of Assistance to States
Program for Education of Handicapped Chilren in State Operated Supported Schools (Public Law 89-313)

Contact: Dr. Gerald Bell 732-1050

This program provides training for teachers and teacher aides as well as providing for education services such as "instruction, physical education, mobility training, pre-vocational and vocational training, and construction and equipment in public schools" (Office for Handicapped Individuals, 1980). The states apply for grants from this program. If a state wishes to use funds for personnel training, it must show how personnel training will fit into the whole program and how it will benefit the handicapped. The program's budget for fiscal 1984 was an estimated $146,000,000.

Division of Innovation and Development
Handicapped Media Services and Captioned Films

Contact: Paul Ackerman 732-1155

This program loans out captioned films for the deaf and provides contacts and grants for research of how the media can be further developed for the benefit of the deaf. It also provides instructional media for the benefit of the handicapped and trains teachers, parents and others in the use of instructional media (Office of the Handicapped, 1980). According to Paul Ackerman, the budget for FY 1984 was approximately tend million.

Post Secondary Education Program for the Handicapped

Contact: Joseph Rosenstein 732-1176

This program funds vocational and technical demonstration projects at the postsecondary level. Occasionally within a given project, funds may be used for personnel training. The 1984 fiscal budget for this program was $5,000,000.

Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Division of State Vocational Program Operations
Vocational Education-Basic Grants to States

Contact: Mr. Nichols

This program provides funds to LEAs for vocational education program. One would need to call a particular state to see if the state plan for vocational education included the training of personnel to work with the handicapped. The program's 1984 fiscal budget included $557,961,728 for Sub-Part 2 of the Vocational Education Basic Grants and $99,941,170 for

Sub-Part 3. At least 10 percent of the state's grant money must support services to the handicapped.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Alcohol, Drug Abuse, Mental Health Administration

Division of Human Resources
Mental Health Clinical Service or Service-Related Training Grants

The 21 million dollar budget is directed toward three priority areas: geriatric care, minorities and disadvantaged, and child mental health. Grants provide training for psychiatrists, social workers, psychologists, and nurses. The handicapped could conceivably receive care from these professionals. Grants of $74,263,000 were awarded in 1979; an estimated $71,663,000 in 1980 and 1981.

Office of Human Development Services

Administration on Aging

Contact: Dr. Posman 245-0350

Research and demonstration model projects of this program promote the welfare of the elderly. One of the areas of concern of these projects is the "needs of the physically and mentally impaired" (Office of Handicapped Individuals, 1980). Funds may go towards the training of physicians, nurses, social workers, architects, and others to work with and serve impaired elderly people.

Developmental Disabilities Services
Administration on Developmental Disabilities
Special Projects

Contacts: Patricia McCormick 245-1961
Janet Bird 245-2897

A grant could conceivably provide funds to train personnel to work with the handicapped in any of the following priority areas: Employment and Income Generation; Community and Family Based Care; Family Services Through the Workplace; Developmentally Disabled Adults; Promoting Family Cohesion; Headstart; Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention; Run Away and Homeless Youth Intervention; Child Welfare; Adoption Opportunities; Elderly and the Family; Program Management Improvements; Gerontology Training. These priority areas in effect may change each year. Grant awards are approximately $100,000. The program's budget for Fiscal Year 1984 was $2,147,000 with approximately $1,000,000 for ongoing projects and $1,500,000 for new projects.

Developmental Disabilities
Basic Support and Advocacy Grants

Contact: Shirley Redman 245-2897
John Pride 245-2897

This program helps states to provide comprehensive services for the developmentally disabled. An agency applying for a grant could conceivably specify funds for personnel training although personnel training is not a priority area of the program. In FY 1984, this program provided funds totaling $8,500,000 for Protection and Advocacy grants and $43,750,000 for Basic Support grants.

Public Health Service

Occupational Safety and Health Training Grants

Contact: Nancy Bridger 404-262-6575

This grant program spent an estimated $8,700,000 in Fiscal Year 1984 to train doctors, nurses, hygienists, and other medical personnel. No funds are directed specifically toward the training of personnel to work with the handicapped.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Community Planning and Development
Block Grants/Entitlements Grants

Contacts: Ms. Drolet 755-9267
Ms. Paul Dorning 755-1312

These grants provide funds for urban revitalization. One of the many ways funds may be used is to develop and maintain Centers for the Handicapped. These Centers may provide services such as recreation, education, health care, social development, independent living, physical rehabilitation, and vocational rehabilitation. Grants support programs in 200 cities. The budget for fiscal year 1983 was $3,456,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration
Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA)

Contacts: Nan Beckley 376-6606
Bob Colombo, Budget Office, 376-6093
Barbara Deveaux 376-2570

This program provides training at the state level for the economically disadvantaged, dislocated workers, the handicapped, and those with limited English. A state program could conceivably have inservice training for personnel to work with the handicapped. The budget for the JTPA program for FY 1984 was apporximately 3 billion dollars.

SOURCES

Ballard, J., Ramirez, B.A., and Weintraub, F.J. (1982). Special education in America: Its legal and governmental foundations. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Clearinghouse on the Handicapped. (1984). Programs for the handicapped. Washington, DC: Office of Information and Resources for the Handicapped.

Clearinghouse on the Handicapped. (1982). Directory for national information sources on handicapping conditions and related services. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education: Clearinghouse on the Handicapped.

Department of Education. (1981). Federal Register. 10 September p.45309.

Farlee, C., Schechter, I., and Hill, D. (1976). Descriptive statements, factual profiles and summary tables documenting the present status of university affiliated facilities concerned with developmental disabilities. Washington, DC: American Association of University Affiliated Programs for the Developmentally Disabled.

Feistritzer, C.E., and Dobson, C. (1981). The 1981 report on education personnel development. Washington, DC: Feistritzer Publications.

Office for Handicapped Individuals. (1980). Federal assistance for programs serving the handicapped. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Office for Handicapped Individuals. (1980). Summary of existing legislation relating to the handicapped. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Office of Human Development Services. (1983). FY 1984 coordinated discretionary funds program. Federal Register. 18 October 1983 p.48380-48398.

Telephone calls to Administrations, Bureaus, Divisions and Offices.